

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,200	12/15/2003	Bob Cusack	053.0002 (026727.0001)	4788
75	90 07/28/2006		EXAM	INER
Erik B cherdak Esq			CUFF, MICHAEL A	
Duane Morris L	LP			
1667 K Street N W Suite 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20006			3627	
			DATE MAIL ED: 07/28/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/734,200	CUSACK ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Michael Cuff	3627	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ms This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ <b>Applicati</b>	Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  on Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce  Applicant may not request that any objection to the	vn from consideration.  r election requirement.  r.  epted or b) □ objected to by the €		
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2)  Notice (3)  Information	be of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection has been withdrawn. Applicant has made it clear that a Jepson claim was intended and proper. Please read MPEP 2129, section III, and state if applicant is implying admission of prior art. There are two cases.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danielson et al. in view of Beach et al. and Derfler Jr. et al.

Danielson et al. shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying real-time communication, the use of a web browser application with control user entry, HTML documents, and peripheral devices including a printer and cash drawers, which automatically open during a sale.

Danielson et al. shows, figures 1 and 3, an in-store multiple device communications unit and centralized data system (electronic data network). Figure 3 shows a district central site 30 (central database facility, central database management facility) in communication through leased line 32 with multiple store location units 31-N (application facilities, client data processing facilities). Figure 1 shows each store

Art Unit: 3627

location units network including a point of sale network 13 (user interfaces, remote point of sale, having self-contained software), which performs the day-to-day sales functions (operation and verification of user-entered data). Sales and operation data (items) are processed through (received, retrieved, accessed) the network. The corporate network 34 (enterprise function) receives and supplies data (enterprise data) to the network.

Derfler, Jr. et al. teaches, page 185, "Today, anyone can subscribe to an Internet service provider, or ISP. An ISP typically leases a high-speed connection to the Internet backbone network, ..."

Based on the teaching of Derfler Jr. et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the leased phone line communication system of Danielson et al. to incorporate a high-speed ISP leased line in place of the Danielson leased line in order to take advantage of well known and available technologies to increase communication speed.

Beach et al. teaches, figure 1, a POS network system using an Internet and intranet scanning terminal system. In a preferred embodiment of the invention, a portable terminal having an integrated machine code reader (script instructions for control user-entry) and a radio is provided with a graphical user interface such as a web browser in order to display instructional files (column 2, lines 8-12). The structure of the system permits the retail facility to use standard programming tools such as HTML 3.0 for the creation of an Intranet/Internet environment for ease of retrieving and converting data files (column 10, lines 35-39). Figure 6 shows many devices including a printer linked to POS terminal 170 in order to document and facilitate sales.

The examiner takes official notice that POS registers can have cash drawers, which open automatically during a sale in order to hold the cash and facilitate the sale.

Based on the teaching of Beach et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the phone line communication system of Danielson et al. to incorporate the Beach et al. communications system including the use of the Internet, a web browser, and HTML documents in order to take advantage of improved displays and improved ability to retrieve and convert data files. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to expand upon the POS terminals of Danielson et al. to incorporate cash drawers which open automatically during a sale in order to hold the cash and facilitate the sale and printers in order to document and facilitate sales.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant is receiving a non-final because the examiner mistyped the rejection.

Please re-read the following from the last office action.

The examiner would like to make a note about the weak claim language used. In a method claim, "permitting" something to happens does not mean that the something has to happen. For example, a system may permit a price change based on low

inventory, but the process step of changing the price at a POS in real-time has not happened. Without positively reciting the method, the examiner is not giving much patentable weight to the content of what may be permitted to change.

Also, the term "downloadable" merely means having the capability of being downloaded.

Applicant has made several arguments about limitations the examiner may not have pointed out. Please review the claim language to see if the limitation is positively recited or if it is merely "permitting" a step.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/734,200

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 6

Michael Luff 7/24/06
Michael Cuff
July 24, 2006